



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/581,268	11/10/2000	Kumar Ramaswamy	RCA88784	2393

7590 05/20/2004
Joseph S Tripoli
Thomson Multimedia Licensing Inc
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08540

EXAMINER

TRAN, TUAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2682	13

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/581,268

Applicant(s)

RAMASWAMY ET AL.

Examiner

Tuan A Tran

Art Unit

2682

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van de Mortel et al. (4,905,272) in view of Chiu et al. (GB 2254225) and further in view of Saegusa et al. (4,864,599).

Regarding claims 1-2, Van de Mortel discloses a wireless telephone system, comprising: one or more wireless handset, each handset inherently comprising a handset transceiver; and a base unit includes a wired interface (See fig. 1), characterized by the base unit further comprising: means for initializing the handset via the wire interface, when the handset is physically docked in the docking station, by providing to the handset a base unit security code (See col. 3 lines 29-35); and a base transceiver for communicating over a channel with each handset via its handset transceiver only if the base unit determines, upon receipt the security code from the handset, that the handset has previously been initialized by the base unit (See col. 2 lines 33-42, col. 4 lines 39-53). The subject matter of claims 1-2 differs from that disclosed in the cited reference by Van de Mortel only in that: during initialization a handset security code is read from the handset and stored to the base unit wherein both

Art Unit: 2682

security codes are based on base unit serial number and handset serial number respectively; and the base transceiver for communicating over a channel with each handset via its handset transceiver only if the base unit determines, upon receipt both security codes from the handset, that the handset has previously been initialized by the base unit. Chiu teaches an initialization process in which a handset security code is read from the handset and stored to the base station via physical interface (See fig. 1 and Abstract). Saegusa suggests the use of serial number as a basic for unique device security codes (See col. 1 lines 39-48). Since all of Van de Mortel, Chiu and Saegusa disclose the process of initialization between handsets and base unit, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teachings or suggestions of Chiu and Saegusa respectively into the wireless telephone system as disclosed by Van de Mortel for the advantage of providing secure communication between the handsets and base unit as well as reducing the total manufacturing cost of a cordless telephone system by eliminating the need to prepare a read-only memory for future system expansion, and further to have included the unique base unit security code in combination with the unique handset security code in transmission to the base unit from the handset for the advantage of enhancing the security of communication between the handsets and base unit.

Claim 9 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1.

Claim 8 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 1, as method.

Regarding claim 3, Van de Mortel & Chiu & Saegusa disclose as cited in claim 1.

PABX cordless telephone system (as disclosed by Van de Mortel) utilized DECT

Art Unit: 2682

technology wherein the DECT-systems utilized TDMA is well known in the art and therefore the bargaining of timeslot for audio packet, as cited in the subject matter of claim 3, is well known in the art.

Regarding claim 4, Van de Mortel & Chiu & Saegusa discloses as cited in claim 1. Since scrambling, which always necessitates knowledge of the scrambler seed by both parties of the communication, is common in the art; therefore, it would be obvious to people skilled in the art to apply such known knowledge into the initialization process of handset and base unit of the wireless telephone system as disclosed by Van de Mortel & Chiu & Saegusa, thereby arriving at the system of claim 4, for the advantage of providing properly communication between handsets and base unit.

Claims 10 and 12 are rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 4.

Claim 11 is rejected for the same reasons as set forth in claim 4, as method.

Regarding claim 5, Van de Mortel & Chiu & Saegusa discloses as cited in claim 1. Van de Mortel further discloses each handset is battery powered by a rechargeable battery and the docking station comprises a charging means for recharging the battery of a handset physically docked in the docking station (See col. 3 lines 29-33).

Regarding claim 6, Van de Mortel & Chiu & Saegusa discloses as cited in claim 5. Van de Mortel further suggests ensuring that the handset is sufficiently charged when performing the initialization (See col. 4 line 59 to col. 5 line 19). This allows not only correct transmission signals during initialization, but inherently permits normal functioning of the handset as well. Since Van de Mortel has realized this problem, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2682

invention was made to have included the means for waiting until after the handset has been recharged above the predetermined threshold before initializing the handset for the advantage of preventing errors occurred due to lacks of power.

Regarding claim 7, Van de Mortel further discloses the handset and the base unit comprises means for exchanging initialization messages during the initialization in accordance with a message format comprising plurality of fields (See fig. 5 and col. 5 lines 30-42).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 04/02/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. The Applicant argued that in contrast with Saegusa, the present invention utilizes a unique handset security code based on (but clearly not the same as only) the handset serial number (See Remark, page 7 paragraphs 1-3). The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's arguments because the limitation "clearly not the same as only the handset serial number" is not disclosed in claims. Saegusa, in fact, does teach the claimed subject matter by suggesting the use of serial number of the handset as unique device security code (See col. 1 lines 39-62). For that reasons, the Examiner maintains his position in rejections of the pending claims.

b. The Applicant argued that none of the references, either taken singly or in combination, disclose all of the limitations of claims 1, 8 and 9 (See Remark, page 6 paragraphs 3-4, page 7 fourth paragraph). In response to the Applicant's arguments,

Art Unit: 2682

The subject matter of claims 1, 8 and 9 differs from that disclosed in the cited reference by Van de Mortel only in that: during initialization a handset security code is read from the handset and stored to the base unit wherein the security code is based on handset serial number; and the base transceiver for communicating over a channel with each handset via its handset transceiver only if the base unit determines, upon receipt security code from the handset, that the handset has previously been initialized by the base unit. Chiu teaches an initialization process in which a handset security code is read from the handset and stored to the base station via physical interface (See fig. 1 and Abstract). Saegusa suggests the use of serial number as a basic for unique device security codes (See col. 1 lines 39-48). Since all of Van de Mortel, Chiu and Saegusa disclose the process of initialization between handsets and base unit, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teachings or suggestions of Chiu and Saegusa respectively into the wireless telephone system as disclosed by Van de Mortel for the advantage of providing secure communication between the handsets and base unit as well as reducing the total manufacturing cost of a cordless telephone system by eliminating the need to prepare a read-only memory for future system expansion. For that reasons, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's arguments and remains the same rejections for all the pending claims.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 2682

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Tuan Tran** whose telephone number is **(703) 605-4255**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Vivian Chin**, can be reached at **(703) 308-6739**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231


or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

· Art Unit: 2682

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.



Tuan Tran

Au 2682



VIVIAN CHIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600